

Every day, ordinary men and women make an extraordinary commitment when they put on a badge that symbolizes the oath they take to protect and serve. The badge also makes them a target. Every day, they leave their families behind not knowing if they will come home tonight.

Madam Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of H.R. 94, the Law Enforcement Officers' Flag Memorial Act of 2001. This legislation seeks to honor slain law enforcement officers by providing their families a Capitol-flown U.S. flag.

In the meantime, Congress should continue to make sure that we keep our commitment to the law enforcement community by providing funding for more officers, better equipment, and advanced training. It not only saves the lives of officers, but it makes our families, our homes, and our neighborhoods a safer place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GLOBAL WARMING AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to address the House and join my colleagues to talk about global warming, to talk specifically about the Kyoto Protocol and the language that is currently in the bill of the Committee on International Relations, the authorizing bill for the State Department to implement the Kyoto Protocol.

I am disappointed that there was not an amendment on the floor to take that particular amendment out of this legislation, because I think the consequences of implementing the Kyoto Protocol are so dramatic that it deserves a discussion before this House. That is why we have joined in this special hour to talk about the consequences if America was to implement the Kyoto Protocol. It is a bad deal for America, and the conferees should examine the implementation language in this bill.

Let me just say that, under this protocol, by 2008 to 2012, the U.S. would be required to slash emissions of greenhouse gases to 7 percent below the 1990 level. That level was last achieved in 1979. Based on projections of the future growth in U.S. energy use, this would require a real cut in emissions of over 30 percent. In the meantime, major

greenhouse gas emitters, such as China, India, Mexico, Brazil, would be able to continue business as usual.

Let me just review the numbers of the total income in this country. The GDP in 1979, it was four trillion eight hundred sixty-nine. Today the GDP, or the total income, the total production of this country is nine trillion one hundred ninety-three.

So based on that kind of efficiency that we had back in 1979, we would have to cut the gross domestic product, the output of this country in half. Of course we have increased our energy efficiency a little bit so, not totally half. But a dramatic change.

So what we are going to be discussing tonight is how scientific is the evidence of global warming, how good is the scientific evidence of how much man contributes to that global warming.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), one of the experts in this area who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality to start off our discussion tonight.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the gentleman from Michigan having this Special Order at the request of the leadership. I think it is important to air the issue, so to speak, as we get into this debate.

I am an official observer to the Council of Parties operating under the auspices of the United Nations. I was in Kyoto. I was in Buenos Aires. I was in Hague. I am planning at the moment to be in Bonn, Germany in July.

I think there are some things that we need to make sure that the American people know about this. First of all, the economy that will be most affected in the entire world community, if we would implement this, is the United States economy.

As the gentleman from Michigan pointed out, China, whose VOC emissions will exceed the United States within the next 10 years, would have to make no reductions. Mexico, which is a growing economy and our partner in NAFTA, would not have to make any reductions because they are considered to be a developing nation. India, the second most populous nation in the world, again with growing VOC emissions, would have to make no reductions because they are considered again to be a developing nation.

So when we get right down to it, the Western European community, because the collapse of communism occurred after the base year that they are using to calculate the reductions, would make few, if any, because they have shut down the old coal plants in the Soviet Union and in behind the Iron Curtain. In Western Europe, they have gone more and more to nuclear power. So they have to make no reductions in their economy. It would be the good old U.S. of A. that would have to make these reductions.

Under the protocol, a steel plant operating in Pennsylvania or in Illinois

or in Indiana that would have to be shut down under the protocol, one could take it bolt by bolt, piece by piece, dismantle it, ship it to China or ship it to Mexico, put it back together, that same plant with the same emissions, and would be perfectly legal under the Kyoto Protocol.

For that reason, it is not just Republicans like the gentleman from Michigan and I that oppose this. Good solid labor union Democrats like the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) strongly oppose this. In fact, when they did the Byrd-Hagel amendment in the United States Senate, it passed 98 to 2 that we cannot implement Kyoto unless certain changes are made so that it does not negatively affect the United States economy.

Second thing that the citizens of the United States need to understand about Kyoto is that the science is not settled. In fact, 2 years ago, 15,000 of the most eminent environmental scientists in the United States signed their names to a letter that I believe was sent to the President. It may have been sent to the Members of Congress. Fifteen thousand scientists said do not implement Kyoto because the science is not settled.

Just within the last 6 months, research based on actual data in the Atlantic Ocean has come out that says the whole concept of global warming may be exactly wrong, could be totally 180 degrees wrong.

□ 2145

So there are all kinds of reasons for us to take a go-slow approach on this. And I think that President Bush, when he said the Kyoto agreement would not be ratified, did exactly the right thing. I think the President and Secretary of State are going to work with Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy to develop a new mechanism for environmental negotiations, not based on Kyoto, but based on sound science and based on economic interests of the United States vis-a-vis the rest of the world.

I would think within the next year or so we will come up with a different mechanism that actually will enhance the environment and will enhance the world community. But the Kyoto agreement, as it is currently structured, is totally flawed. It would be very disadvantageous to the United States. And unless we want to go back to the economy like it was in the 1970s, as the gentleman pointed out, this is exactly the wrong agreement and should not be implemented in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I joined the gentleman from Texas at the Hague, and what the Kyoto Protocol did is it left a lot of the details of implementation to further negotiations. One of the questions at the Hague was the so-called "sinks," the sequestration of the CO₂, and this chart, I think, demonstrates why the United States was trying to insist that sinks be a consideration in emissions. As we see by this